

#### MLTS / Private Switch E 9-1-1 Solution Summary

MLTS E9-1-1 is the only major historical service type that is not fully supported or required to be fully supported for emergency calling and caller location identification.

The ability for PBXs to support E9-1-1 is relatively simple and inexpensive, if capability to do so is programmed into future PBX software. A major reason that the service capability is viewed as costly at present is due to the lack of consistent requirements and standards, making implementations dependent on outboard equipment and custom methods.

Each Emergency Response Location (ERL) requires an assigned Emergency Line Identification Number (ELIN), capable of inward dialing (call back). Each station needs to be associated with the appropriate ELIN as ANI for a 9-1-1 dialed call in the PBX number assignment process. The selected stations that are associated with a given ELIN are totally flexible, and can apply to any breakdown of work spaces desired.

Station	ELIN	ERL,
2367	457-4498	3 <sup>rd</sup> Flr, NW quadrant, 111 N 8 <sup>th</sup> St, Town, State
4213	457-4498	

When the PBX sees 9-1-1 as the dialed digits, look at the 9-1-1 table and send, as ANI, the ELIN number. In today's E9-1-1 process, the ERL info is the basis of ALI records sent to the ALI data base process. In future 9-1-1 systems, this info may flow with the call. The basis of the PBX capability can be a relatively simple administrative table. Of course, it is not quite that simple in application, but conceptually not a large effort for the PBX manufacturor, and easy to use for the PBX operator, if standardized.

It is NENA's view that the expectation for simple, inexpensive, integrated E9-1-1 support within future PBX models will lower user concerns about costs, resulting in less resistance to state legal requirements. That potential will increase interest in passing such laws, hopefully based on NENA's Model Legislation content, so that more standardization in the service from state to state can occur.

NENA has been and stands willing to work with the industry to further develop such standards, but the effort needs to be enabled on a national level. We believe such 'directed influence' from the FCC can result in moving MLTS E9-1-1 from relatively static to an active benefit for the millions of people who work within MLTS environments daily, and expect that a 9-1-1 call for help will result in the same level of service available elsewhere.

### Roadblocks

- Lack of information about safety impacts
- Lack of concern or interest
- Opposition by business
- The first two can be treated through education

R Hixson

Technical Issues Director

rhixson@nena.org



### Opposition by business

- Causes: expense, complication
- Today's solutions are outboard, expensive

#### Solution:

Low cost, simple and consistent method

#### Means:

Standard approach, within the MLTS system design

### If accomplished, results are:

- Business opposition lessens considerably
- States are then able to establish legislation requiring MLTS to support E9-1-1
- Major gap in public safety is removed

### **Enabling requires:**

 Requirements for simple, consistent features in MLTS manufacturer products

Will technology change solve?

- MLTS systems are moving to VoIP
- And, VoIP designs tend to involve real time caller location identification

Good for the future, but:

- Current system designs need solution
- And, IP MLTS needs solution for current
  E9-1-1 systems, prior to IP-based E9-1-1